



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,853	11/28/2006	Ki Suck Jung	288928US0PCT	5523
22850	7590	12/27/2010	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				ZHANG, RACHEL L
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1721				
NOTIFICATION DATE			DELIVERY MODE	
12/27/2010			ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/574,853	JUNG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Rachel L. Zhang	1721	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 October 2010.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-17 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 7 and 18-20 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 06 April 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-6, and 8-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. The steps of filtering and washing is critical or essential to the practice of the invention, but not included in the claim(s) is not enabled by the disclosure. See *In re Mayhew*, 527 F.2d 1229, 188 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1976).

Claims 7 and 18 further include the steps of filtering and washing; the specification (see page 8), and the examples (see Example 1) include the steps of filtering and washing in order to obtain the oxytitanium phthalocyanine compound. Test Example 1 discloses a method of making a photoconductor with the oxytitanium phthalocyanine compound of Example 1, not an oxytitanium phthalocyanine slurry.

Case law holds that applicant's specification must be "commensurately enabling [regarding the scope of the claims]" *Ex parte Kung*, 17 USPQ2d 1545, 1547 (Bd. Pat. App. Inter. 1989) otherwise undue experimentation would be involved in determining how to practice and use applicant's invention. Although the statute itself does not use the phrase "undue experimentation", it has been interpreted to require that the claimed invention be enabled so that any person skilled in the art can make and use the invention without undue experimentation as stated in *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546,

Art Unit: 1721

547 (Bd. Pat. App. Inter. 1986) and in *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Specifically, in *In re Wands* the Court set forth a non-exhaustive list of factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation would be involved in making and/or using the claimed invention. These factors include, but are not limited to: (a) the breadth of the claims; (b) the nature of the invention; (c) the state of the prior art; (d) the level of one of ordinary skill; (e) the level of predictability in the art; (f) the amount of direction provided by the inventor; (g) the existence of working examples; and (h) the quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure.

The disclosure of the instant application, and all of the working examples require the steps of filtering and washing in order to obtain the oxytitanium phthalocyanine compound.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 9-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 5298617 (Nukada).

Nukada discloses an oxytitanium phthalocyanine having a maximum diffraction peak present at a Bragg angel (2Θ +/- 0.2) of 27.3° and other peaks at 24.0°, 18.0°, and 14.3° (column 3, lines 9-20). The oxytitanium phthalocyanine may be used in an electrophotographic photoreceptor (column 2, lines 8-11). Claims 9, 10, and 11 are product by process claims. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production, if the product is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art (see MPEP 2113).

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 7 and 19-20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments, see pages 8-9, filed 10/12/2010, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-8 under Nukada have been fully considered and are persuasive in view of the amendments to the claims. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made as discussed above.

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 9-17 under Nukada have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that

Art Unit: 1721

Nukada does not disclose or suggest any process in which an oxytitanium phthalocyanine material is subjected to grinding. The examiner agrees, however claims 9, 10, and 11 are product by process claims, and are not limited by the process steps, as discussed above.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rachel L. Zhang whose telephone number is (571)272-9802. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri: 8:30-5:00 PM, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Huff can be reached on 571-272-1385. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Christopher RoDee/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1721

RLZ